

SECRET

Subject: ALBESCU, Grigore, / Second Secretary of the Rumanian Permanent Mission
to the United Nations, New York

Date: 15 Mar 1965

DECLASSIFIED AND RELEASED BY
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
SOURCE METHOD EXEMPTION 3B2B
NAZI WAR CRIMES DISCLOSURE ACT
DATE 2007

1. On 10 Mar 1965, from 14.00 to 15.45 hrs. at Champlain Restaurant,
115 W 46th St, NYC, Prof ^{prof} SZUMOWSKI Georg of New York played the role of host
to Subject and C treating them with lunch and drinks. Prof SZUM knows
Subject from the United Nations where they have met quite often and Subject
impressed him as an anti-Russian Rumanian with some knowledge of nationalities
problem of the USSR. Prof SZUM is known to Subject as a correspondent of
Problema and Ukrainian nationalist (in broad sense).

C was introduced by Prof SZUM as a Ukrainian writer and a good friend
of his. They talked in Russian interjecting from time-to-time some English or
French words. The initiative for the meeting came originally from Subject
who wanted to invite PROF SZUM, but the latter suggested instead that he
will invite Subject and C (without mentioning his name) to Champlain restaurant.
Subject agreed to.

2. Subject - aged 38, married, no children, his wife is in New York,
studied law and languages in Bucarest, made only one trip to the Soviet Union
visiting Moscow and Kiev; intelligent, selfassured but not cocksure, speaks
French, fair English and Russian, and some German. A good blend of intelligence
officer and diplomat. Communist or rather Rumanian national communist.
Does not like Russians whom he considers as inferior. Western in appearance and
manners though likes to gesticulate to put emphasis on his argument.
Does not like Bulgarians.

Likes skiing, his vacations spends usually in mountains, no friend of
water, though know how to swim.

Orig sent to RIO/RRP
via ER/O/US + EE

Info to SR/RRP
memo 23 March

SECRET

15 March 65

5X-4452

SECRET

Topics discussed

1. The main topic Subject was interested in was their reaction of Ukrainian emigration in this country and in the free world in general to an eventual demand of Rumania to separate Bessarabia and Bukovina from Ukr SSR and annex them to Rumanian People's Republic. Probed on that Subject stressed that the whole problem was more or less theoretical at the present or rather only in the domain of historical and cultural interests but nevertheless he wanted to know what Ukrainian reaction would be in case some cultural or rather scholarly Rumanian circles would raise "more intensively" this problem. The way, however, Subject was explaining the "innocence" of their demands could not but leave the impression that Bucarest was contemplating "something more political" in regard to Bukovina and Bessarabia. This was also Prof SZUM'S impression whom Subject asked about the same problem a few days earlier at the United Nations.

C's reply was that obviously Ukrainian emigration will be against separation of Bukovina and any other Ukrainian territory from the Ukr SSR but in case Rumania will succeed with her demand, the Rumanian government could "mitigate" the whole situation by giving Ukrainians full cultural autonomy, Ukrainian University, schools, etc. In this respect Rumania would have even an easy competition in ^{wooing} some Ukrainian sympathies by contrasting their positive cultural policy against ~~Rumanian~~ Soviet Russification policy in Ukraine herself.

Subject commented by pointing out to their present cultural policy toward Ukrainians mentioning Ukrainian schools, a department of Ukrainistics at Bucaresti University, and Ukrainian paper published in 70,000 copies.

2. Asked by C whether it meant that De-Russification that took place in recent years in Rumania was not to be identified or rather ^{co-identified} ~~superimposed~~ with some sort of DE-Ukrainianization as well, Subject replied that these were two separate things. Without elaborating he began to describe in what the De-Russification itself consisted: "Thus, where there was a library or street or theater previously called Scala or any other Rumanian name and then renamed into Pushkins or Molotovs, we changed it again into Scala..."

Furthermore, this was a natural consequence of the changed international

3. According to Subject a reversal of the present situation in Eastern Europe toward new centralization of the Soviet block was impossible. The enhancement of political and economic status of the satellites with exception perhaps of Bulgaria, and their contacts with other part of the world and particularly with the West was the best guarantee against such a reversal. Asked whether he did not think that internal Soviet politics were a quite a decisive factor too, moreover that ~~that~~ the new ~~post-Stalin process~~ ~~historical~~ historically came from Moscow itself, he did not deny the importance of them and added the conflict between Moscow and Peking as another "very important element, indeed".

Subject were not against the concept of rebuilding the Soviet Union into a real socialist commonwealth and extending the process of selfassertion of nations to Ukraine and other non-Russian republics. He saw however no objective conditions for that at the present. On this occasion he mentioned Georgians as a very nationally conscious element but in his opinion this sense of nationality was less articulated and weaker among Ukrainians and other non-Russians. Of course, he was aware of Ukrainian ambitions and did not deny their significance but the problem was whether under the circumstances Ukrainians were capable to go as far as, for instance, Rumanians. He did not think it possible unless Ukrainians "show more strength".

Told by C that Rumanian people and communists in particular could help in this respect very much their Ukrainian colleagues, Subject wanted to know how. C began with cultural exchange, "good examples" etc. Subject listened but did not comment.

C asked him what he thought about his Ukrainian friends at the United Nations. Smiling Subject replied that so far he saw no specific trends in this direction among them, they always try to convince everybody that they feel very happy, and on the other hand if there are different tendencies it would be too dangerous to talk about them here.

As to his observations from Kiev on his trip to Moscow he had noticed great difference between Russia and Ukraine but, of course, this was not enough for making any political conclusions. In general his impression was that Ukrainians, at least here in New York, are as subservient or perhaps even more, as the Russians, as Bulgarians.

Actually Subject has little communication with Ukrainians at the United Nations and he only knows Mr MATSEIKO who seems to be quite a nice

3. According to Subject a reversal of the present situation in Eastern Europe toward new centralization of the Soviet block was impossible. The enhancement of political and economic status of the satellites with exception perhaps of Bulgaria, and their contacts with other part of the world and particularly with the West was the best guarantee against such a reversal. Asked whether he did not think that internal Soviet politics were a quite a decisive factor too, moreover that ~~that~~ the new ~~post Stalin process~~ ~~historically~~ came from Moscow itself, he did not deny the importance of them and added the conflict between Moscow and Peking as another "very important element, indeed".

Subject were not against the concept of rebuilding the Soviet Union into a real socialist commonwealth and extending the process of selfassertion of nations to Ukraine and other non-Russian republics. He saw however no objective conditions for that at the present. On this occasion he mentioned Georgians as a very nationally conscious element but in his opinion this sense of nationality was less articulated and weaker among Ukrainians and other non-Russians. Of course, he was aware of Ukrainian ambitions and did not deny their significance but the problem was whether under the circumstances Ukrainians were capable to go as far as, for instance, Rumanians. He did not think it possible unless Ukrainians "show more strength".

Told by C that Rumanian people and communists in particular could help in this respect very much their Ukrainian colleagues. Subject wanted to know how. C began with cultural exchange, "good examples" etc. Subject listened but did not comment.

C asked him what he thought about his Ukrainian friends at the United Nations. Smiling Subject replied that so far he saw no specific trends in this direction among them, they always try to convince everybody that they feel very happy, and on the other hand if there ^{are} different tendencies it would ^{be} too dangerous to talk about them here.

As to his observations from Kiev on his trip to Moscow he had noticed great difference between Russia and Ukraine but, of course, this was not enough for making any political conclusions. In general his impression was that Ukrainians, at least here in New York, are as subservient or perhaps even more, as the Russians, ~~as~~ Bulgarians.

Actually Subject has little communication with Ukrainians at the United Nations and he only knows Mr MATSEIKO who seems to be quite a nice

4. As an example of independence achieved by Rumania Subject mentioned a treaty on Exploitation of uranium ore in Rumania concluded between the USSR and Rumania in 1951 for ten years which had given the Soviet Union exclusive rights to research and exploitation of uranium, and which Rumanians refused to prolong in 1961 despite strong pressures of the Soviet Government. "Now we (Rumanians) exploit uranium ore ourselves and for peaceful purposes only".

5. As to the conference of representatives of 19 communist parties in Moscow Subject said that Rumania did not send her delegation "because from the outset we knew that nothing will come out of it".

6. Subject claimed not to know how many Ukrainian or other Soviet students were in Rumania but "anyway not many". As to black or rather colored students from Africa and Asia "we don't waste money on them".

7. Asked why communists in the satellites and in the West do not criticize Soviet imperialism and colonialism which does tarnish the whole idea of communism, Subject replied that this was not altogether so because Togliatti had attacked Soviet colonialism. ~~xxxxxxx~~ Subject agreed, however, that this was not sufficient. He personally had no doubt as to existence of Soviet or rather Russian imperialism "though it might be different in some features from the Western".

8. Subject promised to get "Novyi Vik", Ukrainian paper published in Rumania. At least he will try.

9. Jokes were told and Subject contributed two:

a/ Late President Kennedy came to heaven. From behind the door Stalin burst on him with a thick stick and wanted to hit him. Then suddenly looked again at Kennedy and puzzled made a step back. Kennedy confused even more than Stalin asked him what was the matter. Stalin looked at him apologetically and replied, "Sorry I thought it was Khrushchev who came here after me, too."

b/ Khrushchev bought a nice material for suit for himself in Sweden. Knowing that Italians were supposed to be the best tailors he

SECRET

he was "bolshoi chelovek" and the material will not^{be} sufficient to make even a jacket. Angry Khrushchev went with the material to Sweden. There, in Stockholm, the same story; too little material, Khrushchev - "bolshoi chelovek". Even more angry Khrushchev went to Moscow and called his best tailor. Again the same story; Khrushchev - bolshoi chelovek and there is too little material.

Then Khrushchev remembered that someone was praising to him Rumanian tailors. So he goes to Bucarest. The Rumanian tailor measured Khrushchev then the material, and asks: "Mr Khrushchev, you want one pair of ~~pants~~ trousers or two, and would you like to have also a cap?" Completely flabbergasted Khrushchev asks how is it possible to make so much out of this material. He was in Italy, in Sweden and in Moscow and the tailors there could not even make one suit. "Well - explains the Rumanian - you see Mr Khrushchev, in Stockholm, in Rome, in Moscow, you are bolshoi chelovek but for us you are so small that we can even make additional pair of trousers and a cap".

Subject explained that this joke was circulating before Khrushchev's downfall and at one time there were some second thought about it after a Western magazine had published a note that Khrushchev indeed was making some suits in Rome. Rumanians did not want to be reproached with basing their jokes on true stories supplied by Western press.

SECRET